

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Columbus Day, Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). A volume usually contains twenty-six or twenty-seven issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.

Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, New York.
Editor, Charles Knapp (Barnard College, Columbia University).
Address, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York, New York.

VOLUME XXIX, No. 22

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1936

WHOLE No. 794

THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT THE ORIGIN OF THE OLYMPIC GAMES

DID THEY ORIGINATE IN 776 B. C.?

For the past half-century a debate has been carried on among philologists and historians in Europe on the authenticity of the date 776 B. C. as that of the first celebration of the Olympic games. The doubts concerning the correctness of this date have involved other doubts concerning the accuracy of the earlier portions of Eusebius's register of Olympic victors, and concerning the use of the Olympic register as a basis of Greek chronology for a considerable period of time.

Mahaffy¹ was the first to offer more than a mere opinion against the acceptance of 776 B. C. as a solid basis for Greek chronology. He remarks that Sir George Cox² would regard 670 B. C. as the earliest historical date available, and states that it is his object to corroborate Mure³ in his questioning of the authenticity of the earlier parts of the list handed down by Eusebius. The list as transmitted by Eusebius was copied from that of Julius Africanus, who brought the register down to 217 A. D. Africanus in turn was indebted to Hippas of Elis, the original compiler of the list, who flourished from 390 to 370 B. C.⁴, and whose work was revised and supplemented by other writers, including Aristotle and Phlegon⁵. If the more remote and purely mythical accounts of the establishment of the Olympic games by Heracles as recorded by Pindar⁶ and Pausanias⁷ are disregarded, the first victory recorded in the list, that of Coroebus of Elis in the stade, in 776 B. C., is supposed to be coincident with the reestablishment of the games in historic times. Unfortunately the traditions of this reestablishment are not unanimous in their accounts. Pausanias⁸ records that Oxylus, King of Elis, had held the games, but that they were discontinued until the time of Iphitus, of the family of Oxylus, who renewed them when Coroebus won in the stade, and that from this point the unbroken tradition of the Olympiads begins. It is also recorded by Pausanias that the sacred Olympic truce was revived by Iphitus at the same time, and that this arrangement is said to have been made between him and his contemporary, Lycurgus of Sparta⁹. Mahaffy¹⁰ notes that other authorities, such as

Polemo, quoted by the scholiast on Pindar (Olympia 5. 3-8), agree with Pausanias in some of these details. Strabo¹¹ quotes from Ephorus the double foundation of the games by Oxylus and again by Iphitus. Phlegon¹², in the time of Hadrian, and Eusebius¹³ introduce a third participant in the sacred truce, Cleosthenes, King of Pisa. Phlegon, moreover, apparently saw some difficulty in making Lycurgus, Iphitus, and Coroebus contemporary. He therefore places Lycurgus and Iphitus some 27 or 28 Olympiads before 776. But Phlegon contradicts himself by the statement that in Olympiad 6 Iphitus consulted the Delphic oracle. Weniger¹⁴ observes that this would create a difference of 34 Olympiads, or 136 years, and that the possibility of a second Iphitus is as great as that of a second Lycurgus in Plutarch (Lycurgus 1).

Such contradictory traditions were supplemented by Mahaffy with others no less confusing. He observes¹⁵ that Iliad 23, describing the funeral games of Patroclus, was composed without any reference to the earliest Olympic games as Pausanias describes them. His opinion was that the Homeric Poems were growing into shape about the time of Olympiad I and shortly thereafter; hence the contrast between the games in the Iliad, where many contests were held, and the early Olympics, where the stade was the sole event, would be difficult to explain. This view he supports by the description of Pindar¹⁶ of the games as founded by Heracles, where the names of no less than five winners in various events are given. Only once¹⁷ does Pindar mention a victor in the stade, and here the pentathlon is also mentioned. Nor does Pindar ever say that the victors of the stade would have the honor of giving their name to an Olympiad, while Thucydides¹⁸ speaks of an Olympiad when Androsthenes won in the pancratium, seemingly giving preference to this event over the stade. Another discrepancy noted by Mahaffy was that Pausanias¹⁹ ascribes to Orsippus of Megara the introduction of the custom of running naked in the games, whereas Thucydides, as well as his contemporaries, Herodotus and Hellanicus, remarks that 'it was not many years' since the habit of running naked had come into fashion at Olympia. This would involve a discrepancy of about three centuries. To supplement Ma-

¹John Pentland Mahaffy, *On the Authenticity of the Olympian Register*, *Journal of the Hellenic Society* 2 (1881), 164-178.

²Mahaffy gives no reference here.

³William Mure, *A Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece*, 4:77-90 (London, 1850-1857. Five volumes).

⁴Mahaffy, 178 (see note 1, above).

⁵Compare E. Norman Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, 50 (London, Macmillan, 1910), and Julius Juthner, *Philostatus über Gymnastik*, 60-70 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1909).

⁶Olympia 2. 5.7.4. ⁷5.4.3-4. 8.2. 20.1. 8.26.3.

⁸Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 1, 23.

⁹Mahaffy, 166 (see note 1, above).

¹¹Strabo 357.

¹²Karl Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, 3.604 (Paris, Didot, 1849).

¹³Appendix IV. 64 (edition by Alfred Schoene [Berlin, Weidmann, 1875]).

¹⁴Ludwig Weniger, *Das Hochfest des Zeus in Olympia*, *Klio* 5 (1905), 184-218.

¹⁵Mahaffy, 167 (see note 1, above).

¹⁶Olympia 10.60-75. ¹⁷Olympia 13.30.

¹⁸5.49. Likewise Thucydides 3.8 mentions a victory of Dorieus, the pancratiast, in Olympiad 88.

¹⁹1.44.1.

haffy's observation it might be noted that Dionysius of Halicarnassus²⁰ ascribes to Acanthus of Sparta the institution of this custom, being supported therein by Thucydides²¹, who asserts that the Spartans were the first to run in the nude at Olympia.

Mahaffy²² wonders why Hippias selected the year 776 for the commencement of his list, and is willing to recognize the accuracy of the list only after Olympiad 50. He is suspicious of the fact that eight Messenians are among the first twelve victors; that only two Eleans appear, and these in the first two celebrations; that Oebotas is supposed to have won in Olympiad 6, but elsewhere is said to have fought at Plataea in Olympiad 75, while his statue and epigram date from about Olympiad 80²³; and that Athenian victors are always in juxtaposition to Laconian. He thinks that Hippias tried to determine the date of the first Olympiad through Iphitus, but that the number of Olympiads was accommodated to the date of Iphitus, and not the date of Iphitus to the number of Olympiads. In summarizing, Mahaffy is willing to believe that by 580 B. C. the festival was pretty strictly regulated, and the victors' names recorded in inscriptions. Hippias must have constructed the whole history of the festival, partly from evidence before him, partly from the analogy of other festivals. He apparently fixed the commencement by the date of the mythical founder, so that neither the dates nor the names found in Eusebius's register for the first fifty Olympiads can be accepted as genuine, unless corroborated by other evidence.

Busolt²⁴ found Mahaffy's arguments only in part convincing, but his scepticism capable of further support. To the doubts expressed already in antiquity by Plutarch²⁵ about the trustworthiness of Hippias he pays little attention. But he cannot accept the tradition that in the first thirteen Olympiads the stade was the sole event, or that Olympiads should be designated by victors in the stade. He recalls that Thucydides²⁶ had twice designated Olympiads by victors in the pancratium; that Philistos²⁷ gives the first evidence of the prominence of stade victors; and that Hippias wrote between the time of Thucydides and that of Philistos. If the designation of Olympiads by stade victors were official, Busolt cannot understand why Thucydides did not follow this custom. Busolt further recalls the multiplicity of events in the epic contests, and states that, since the Elean nobility was a cavalier nobility, it would be improbable that a hippic event should be introduced as late as the 24th Olympiad, or 680 B. C. Finally, Busolt does not understand why the boxing contest, a simple event, should not be introduced until 688 B. C., five Olympiads after the pentathlon, a com-

posite event, which was supposedly inaugurated in 708 B. C.

After these negative arguments of Mahaffy and Busolt there appears a single proponent—Diels²⁸—for the authenticity of the register. Diels, however, limits himself merely to the following statement: "Ich folgere keineswegs mit neueren Skeptikern (vgl. Mahaffy J. H. S. II, 164) die Unzuverlässigkeit der ganzen Olympionikenüberlieferung daraus, obgleich schon Plutarch ähnlich denkt". A considerable number of attacks is to be cited before a defense of any extent is met with.

Körte²⁹, evidently unfamiliar with Busolt's discussion, cites only Beloch³⁰ as having agreed with Mahaffy in doubting the authenticity of the records of the first Olympiads. Körte is willing to admit that Africanus, Pausanias, Diodorus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Philostratus agree rather closely in their lists and their comments. But to him also it is inconceivable that the Olympic games should be at such variance with those of the Iliad. The epic funeral games are essentially no different from the great games³¹ in Greek history, since these also were founded in honor of heroes and dead ancestors, and even at Olympia the Eleans sacrificed to Pelops before they sacrificed to Zeus³². Since, then, the funeral games are not to be distinctly separated from other games, it would be peculiar that only foot-races should be held at Olympia for the first 68 years in the history of the festival, particularly since these games were supposed to attract contestants from all the Peloponnesus and even from Megara. The next evidence brought in by Körte is that offered by the bronze dedicatory objects at Olympia³³, many of which are to be dated earlier than 700 B. C.³⁴ Most of them are in the geometric style. Among them are numerous horses of clay and bronze, with the evident remains of halters and yokes belonging to small, two-horse chariots. Körte argues that the use of such dedicatory objects is understandable only if horses and chariots played a part in the Olympic games at that time. But the traditional dates for the entry of the four-horse chariot race and the two-horse chariot race are 680 and 408 B. C. In the epics the two-horse chariot race only was known; hence the assumption is that this contest occurred quite early at Olympia, was displaced by the more impressive four-horse event, and only reinstated in 408. Körte also observes that, whenever Thucydides³⁵ endeavors to give an exact date, he does so according to the Ephors in Sparta and the Archons in Athens, but does not use the Olympiads. Then, too, the action of Thucydides in giving eponymous character to the pancratium coincides with the oldest inscriptional information about Olym-

²⁰7.72.3. Compare Eusebius I. 195 (see note 13, above).

²¹1.6. ²²Mahaffy, 175-176 (see note 1, above).

²³Pausanias 6.3.8, 7.17.13.

²⁴Georg Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*³, I.586, note 2, and 587, note 1 (Gotha, Perthes, 1893).

²⁵Plutarch (Numa 1) says (I give the translation by Bernadotte Perrin, in *The Loeb Classical Library*, I. 309 (1914)): "... Chronology, however, is hard to fix, and especially that which is based on the names of the victors in the Olympic games, the list which is said to have been published at a late period by Hippias of Elis, who had no fully authoritative basis for his work...."

²⁶See notes 18, 21, above.

²⁷Fragment 6 = Stephanus of Byzantium, s. v. Δόμη.

²⁸Hermann Diels, *Die Olympionikenliste aus Oxyrhynchus*, *Hermes* 36 (1901), 80.

²⁹Alfred Körte, *Die Entstehung der Olympionikenliste*, *Hermes* 39 (1904), 224-243.

³⁰*Griechische Geschichte*, I.10 (see note 24, above). A detailed account of Beloch's views will be given later.

³¹Körte refers to the Isthmian, Nemean, Pythian, and Olympic games.

³²Scholion to Pindar, *Olympia* I.149.

³³Adolf Furtwängler, *Die Bronzefunde von Olympia*, *Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie*, 1879; *Die Bronzen und die Uebrigen Kleineren Funde* (Berlin, Asher and Company, 1890).

³⁴Otto Puchstein, *Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, II. 70-77 (Berlin, Reimer, 1897).

³⁵2.2.

pia³⁶. For further proof that the Olympic list was of late construction, it is to be noted that the Anolympiads (8, 34) recorded by Pausanias³⁷, and the Anolympiad of Olympiad 104 all appear in the list of Africanus supplied with names of victors. In short, Körte believes that up to the end of the fifth century there was no connected victor list and no history of the Olympic games, so that the date 776 B. C. as that of the first Olympiad is to be rejected.

Just as positively as Mahaffy, Busolt, and Körte deny the authenticity of the early traditions of the Olympic register, Weniger defends it. He believes definitely³⁸ that in the first thirteen Olympiads there was but one event, the stade, and that during this period the festival lasted only two days; other days were added as the number of events was increased. The stade took place after the sacrifice and at first was subordinate to it. Similarly in mythology Oenomaus and Heracles first sacrificed and then permitted the contests to follow. The sacrifice always constituted the essence of the Olympics. Weniger does not deny³⁹ that chariot races and other events took place in the 'Urzeit' at Olympia, but he believes that the historical beginning in 776 was chiefly a religious service, and that it cannot be proven that there were chariot races in the first 24 Olympiads. The finding of bronze figures of horses and chariots around the old altar is not sufficient evidence, and Körte goes too far, although it may be conceded that the first 50 Olympiads are more or less obscure. These small bronze objects may have been dedicatory offerings for the gods or the dead, or scenes of every day life. Furthermore, only likenesses of gymnastic victors were permitted at first, and in the first hippic dedications only the horses, and not the drivers, were reproduced. The stade as a single event rests not only on tradition, but also on the comparison with the Heraean games for girls, which existed even before the festival sacred to Zeus⁴⁰.

Gardiner⁴¹ is the next scholar to offer an opinion on the controversy. He concludes that Mahaffy, Busolt, and Körte have proved that the register is imperfect, and that the task of compiling it was difficult, or otherwise men like Hippias and Aristotle would not have devoted their time to it. But Gardiner cannot believe that Hippias would have imposed a purely fictitious list of victors on the critical Greek world at the end of the fifth century, or that Aristotle would have worked on the list without some evidence as a basis for his labors. Besides official lists there may have been many local lists of Olympic victors, family records, genealogies, inscriptions on monuments, from which Hippias could during his travels have collected material for his register. Although his list may have been imperfect and inaccurate, it is sufficiently accurate to afford valuable indications of the growth and the de-

velopment of the festival. Yet Gardiner qualifies these statements by expressing the belief that, contrary to the tradition, the first Olympiad included at least all the events mentioned by Pindar, and that, if the games did develop from a single event, the development was probably from the armed fight or the chariot race, not from the stade.

If Gardiner's opinions could be considered as in the main favorable to the tradition, Beloch's⁴² emphatically are not favorable to it. He thinks it extremely improbable that such a secluded spot as Elis should have a register of victors for a festival of purely local importance almost a hundred years before the Athenians had a list of Archons⁴³ or the Spartans a list of the Karneionikai. The picture transmitted of the building up of the various events of the festival is to him "völlig unhistorisch". Beloch accepts and repeats the negative arguments already mentioned, the inconsistency between the epic and the early Olympic games, the evidence offered by the bronze dedicatory objects, the statements of Plutarch and Thucydides, but thinks that Körte has gone too far in assuming that there were no victor lists at all before Hippias. Such an assumption would contradict all analogy. Furthermore, against Körte's arguments he believes that the Pythian list of Aristotle rested without doubt on recorded material. From about Olympiad 50 Beloch will admit that Hippias used historical records, since the victor from Elis in Olympiad 52 is historical without any doubt, and the two victors from Croton in Olympiads 48 and 49 do not appear to have been drawn merely from the imagination.

It remained for Brinkmann⁴⁴ to crystallize the arguments of those inclined to favor the tradition of the founding and the development of the Olympic games as it has been transmitted. In addition to the literary evidence vouching for the existence of the stade as the only contest originally, he adds that of an Attic inscription⁴⁵. He thinks that the only arguments used by Körte—namely, that sacrifice was made first to Pelops, then to Zeus, and hence that the games were of heroic origin—are met by Weniger⁴⁶. Brinkmann asks whether Pindar's account of the mythical founding of the games by Heracles, and the mention of a multiplicity of events should be used as a basis for historical reckoning. Yet it is so used by Mahaffy, Gardiner, and Beloch. As to Körte's archaeological evidence Brinkmann recalls that among the bronze figures of horses and chariots there were also miniature warrior figures, weapons, oxen, and sheep. Thus Körte's use of these objects as arguments would lead *ad absurdum*. Other minor inconsistencies are passed over by Brinkmann as inconclusive. The tradition regarding the Anolympiads he finds so full of contradictions as to be utterly uncertain. He quotes the ninth of Lehrs's ten commandments for classical philologists, to the effect that ten poor reasons should not

³⁶Namely, Inscriptionen von Magnesia Nr. 16 = Wilhelm Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*³, Volume 2, Number 557 (Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1917).

³⁷6.22.2.

³⁸Das Hochfest des Zeus in Olympia, *Klio* 4 (1904), 125, note 2. Compare note 14, above.

³⁹*Klio* 5 (1905), 30, note 1 (see note 14, above).

⁴⁰Weniger, *Klio* 5 (1905), 191, note 2.

⁴¹Gardiner, 50-52 (see note 5, above). Subsequent comments by Gardiner will be noted later.

⁴²*Griechische Geschichte*², 1.148-154 (see note 24, above).

⁴³Beloch places the beginning of this list at 683 B. C.

⁴⁴August Brinkmann, *Die Olympische Chronik*, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 70 (1915), 622-637.

⁴⁵Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, Volume 3, Number 1079 (1920. See note 36, above).

⁴⁶Ludwig Weniger, *Klio* 5 (1905), 30, note 1 (see note 39, above), thought that the sacrifice to Pelops before Zeus might have been the *enagismos* on the evening before the hekatomb.

be believed equal to one good one, and speaks of the stubborn scepticism of the historian. By way of constructive argument, and in answer to the suspicions of Mahaffy, Brinkmann maintains that the fact that the Messenians flourished for a while as victors and then disappeared, whereupon the Spartans became prominent, can only be construed as due to a political calamity. One State must have been crushed and the other raised to power. The twenty years' war, then, between Sparta and Messenia must have occurred in this period. In addition to this, the victors following the last Messenian victory came from territories that took no part in the war, namely, Cleonae, Corinth, and Elis. Brinkmann does not believe it probable that such agreement between historical events and the register of victors could be merely historical tact and cleverness on the part of Hippias. If the names of the victors in Olympiads 1, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38 and 48 are compared with inscriptional evidence, it can be seen that the victors actually came from Athens, Thebes, and Sparta. Of the Athenians, three, Cylon (Olympiad 35), Phrynon (Olympiad 36), and Alcmaeon (Olympiad 42), are well known in Athenian history outside of their Olympic activity. The other three names, Pantacles (Olympiads 21, 22), Eurybatus (Olympiad 27), and Stomas (Olympiad 34), can be substantiated as Attic. With this constructive evidence Brinkmann feels that the Olympic tradition of Hippias has met the last test that can possibly be brought to bear upon it.

Shortly after Brinkmann's vigorous defense of the Olympic register, in brief fashion L. Ziehen⁴⁷ acted as unofficial umpire of the question. In support of Weniger and Brinkmann he states it to have been shown by Foucart that the Attic Eleusinian games had only one event at the beginning. The high esteem of the stade is indicated also by the fact that stade victors in the Panathenian games received the highest prize⁴⁸. Ziehen cannot, however, reject as lightly as Brinkmann does the contention that the list may have been only an ingenious reconstruction. He feels personally convinced that Hippias, even as Aristotle, used records, but feels that he must withhold judgment as to whether this material was defective or trustworthy.

No less an authority than Wilamowitz⁴⁹ is the next to discuss the question. The arguments offered by Brinkmann appear to him conclusive in the defense of the victor list. He observes that an Oxyrhynchus papyrus⁵⁰ shows all victors carefully registered after 480 B. C., and that all other reports on the years covered by the papyrus agree or are verified by this list. How far back such lists may go is not known, but certainly they go farther back than the foundation of the other great games. The fact that pancratiasts receive preference over stade victors in certain instances is explained as being due to natural tendency, that, since one name only was used, an especially famous one would be taken. The use of eponymous stade victors Wilamowitz be-

lieves to date from the first century B. C. The list of Africanus agrees with those of other sources, except for obvious mistakes, which are mostly to be explained by the geographical juxtaposition of States, or by the political absorption of some States by others⁵¹. More than the name of the victor and his homeland could not be expected, except in the case of victory statues, where the father's name also is added. Hippias could reckon time in his list only if, from a fixed point, he counted an Olympiad of four years for every name. That Olympiads were penteteric in the eighth century is, however, unbelievable; if they were not penteteric, 776 B. C. is too early a date for the celebration of the first Olympics. Concerning the list of names there can be no reasonable doubt, except about that of the first victor, Coroebus of Elis, since that name first occurs in literature as the designation of a Phrygian⁵². But from Olympiad 2 we stand on solid ground. One can doubt, but only doubt, the Elean Coroebus. On the Anolympiads we find in the list of Africanus that Olympiad 28 was held by the Pisans because Elis was at that time at war with Dyme. From Olympiad 30 the Pisans also held the games for 22 Olympiads, and in Olympiad 53 an Elean won. The absence of Eleans and the preponderance of Laconians coincides well with the political history of these 22 Olympiads. Thus the Anolympiads in the register could easily be verified, if Pausanias⁵³ had not placed the first in Olympiad 8 under Pheidon of Argus. Wilamowitz would emend Olympiad 8 to Olympiad 28, thereby reaching an agreement with Africanus, and dating the monarch Pheidon ca. 668 B. C.⁵⁴

In his second discussion of the controversy Gardiner⁵⁵ does not feel, as Wilamowitz did, that the Olympic penteteris could not go back to the eighth century. From analogy with other games he thinks that the periods would change from eight or four years to two, and not the reverse. It is by no means improbable that the Olympic festival was originally held every eighth year, but the change probably took place, he thinks, at least as early as 776 B. C. The real history of the Olympics begins with the first Olympiad in 776, but it is hardly probable that this marks the actual beginning or even the revival of the festival. Rather it was possibly at this date that an eight-year festival was changed to one recurring every fifth year. Certain it is, Gardiner states⁵⁶, that from this time the games were held every four years. A complete list of victors was of no value for chronology, and Africanus, following the practice of early times, gives only the name and the city of the stade victor, the first event inscribed on the official lists. From this practice arose the popular and mistaken idea that the stade race was the most honored of all events, and that the winner of it gave his name to the Olympiad.

Kahrstedt⁵⁷ bases his arguments against the authenticity of early Olympic history on the traditions con-

⁴⁷Ludwig Ziehen, Bericht über die Griechischen Sakralaltertümer, in Jahresberichte über die Fortschritte der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, 1915, 66-71.

⁴⁸See Inscriptiones Graecae 2.965 b.

⁴⁹Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Pisa und die Olympische Sieger, in Pindaros, 481-490, and notes (Berlin, Weidmann, 1922).

⁵⁰Number 222, in Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 2; Carl Robert, Hermes 35 (1900), 141-155.

⁵¹For the complete discussion compare Wilamowitz, 482, note 2 (see note 49, above). ⁵²Pausanias 10.27.1. ⁵³Pausanias 6.22.2.

⁵⁴For a discussion of the sacred truce between Iphitus and Lycurgus see Wilamowitz (see note 49, above).

⁵⁵E. Norman Gardiner, Olympia: Its History and Remains, 69-87 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1928). ⁵⁶Ibidem, 86.

⁵⁷Ulrich Kahrstedt, Zur Geschichte von Elis und Olympia, 157-176, in Nachrichten von Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen aus dem Jahre 1927 (Berlin, Weidmann, 1928).

cerning the number of Hellanodicae, who presided over the games, and the Anolympiads. Treating these subjects at considerable length and finding undeniable inconsistencies in the traditions concerning them, he admits that, although the authenticity of the register is affected only in a general way by these inconsistencies, yet the list is connected on one side with the history of the games, and on the other with the management of the games, and the officials. In opposition to Brinkmann he considers the bronze dedicatory objects as further proof. As to the sources, Eusebius was perhaps only a degree more honest than Pausanias, who never recognizes anything but an Elean Olympia. The consistency of victors, localities, and historic events is too plausible to be untrue. Yet it is strange that localities are not mentioned which existed earlier than Pisa and Messene. All other places are forgotten in favor of the political geography established by Elis. Further, in the first fifty years of a local festival celebrated in Pisa, according to Hippias, winners are named from Dyme, Messene, Cleonae, and elsewhere, but never from Pisa itself. While agreeing that the proper names are not objectionable, as Brinkmann pointed out, Kahrstedt⁸⁸ suggests that no editor would have to look up many names. He would merely collect family traditions, distribute these to the Olympiads, add a group of heroes, and "der Bedarf war reichlich zu decken". The victor list, therefore, stands as far from the real circumstances of the seventh and the sixth centuries as does Pausanias's account of the history of the contest and of the Hellanodicae.

As Brinkmann summarized the arguments in defense, similarly Beloch⁸⁹ summarizes those against the Olympic tradition. In support of the citation of Pindar as an authority, it is submitted that, although Pindar made no historical studies, still he represents what was commonly believed at the time. Even two centuries after Hippias an inscription from Magnesia⁹⁰ uses the victor in the pancratium for dating, as Thucydides had done long before. It is clear that the Magnesians followed the customary procedure of their time. The reference to the stade as the only contest for women in the Heraean games is not convincing. Where in the wide world, and in what events, could they otherwise have participated?, asks Beloch⁹¹. Should they have boxed, thrown the javelin, or driven a chariot? Admitting the names of the first eleven victors to be genuine, Beloch is suspicious of the fact that five of them, Coroebus, Oebotas, Androcles, Dotades, and Polychares, are heroes. The plausibility of other victors is ascribed to the ingenuity of Hippias and his knowledge of concurrent events. A further ground for suspicion is found in the few Elean victors⁹²; in view of the local character of the festival in the early periods, we should expect to find many Elean victors. Again, Beloch asks⁹³ if we should really believe that a list of Olympic victors was made an entire century before the Athenians thought

of making a list of Archons? The stade as the sole event, and the confusing accounts concerning the number of Hellanodicae are other matters treated by Beloch. He asserts that Brinkmann has absolutely nothing to place against these arguments, but that he limits himself solely to the fact that up to Olympiad 50 the names of victors give no occasion for suspicion. Brinkmann's work, Beloch asserts, is "ein wahres Muster dafür, wie man solche Probleme nicht behandeln soll"⁹⁴. The view of Wilamowitz is treated more circumspectly, but even Wilamowitz was dubious of the authenticity of Coroebus, and if of one name, why not of others? Further, the penteteric character of the festival in the eighth century is unbelievable. To place the beginning of the genuine list at Olympiad 50 (580 B. C.) must be nearly right, but even from this point until 550 B. C. the list does not deserve unconditional trust.

Only one further opinion, Gardiner's final discussion of the subject⁹⁵, remains to be considered. Gardiner merely repeats that the records of the first two centuries are perhaps unreliable in detail, but extraordinarily clear and consistent in the story they tell.

Not all phases of the problem have been treated in this paper, nor have all authorities been cited. Some authorities on the great games of antiquity have preferred to pass over the problem altogether⁹⁶. Confronted by such a group of scholars and by such a conflicting mass of evidence one may well be in doubt which view to accept. An analysis of the arguments against the traditional date and the answers thereto would indicate, however, that, until other and better evidence is submitted, the traditional date can stand as acceptable. The argument that the Olympic games should be more like those described in the Iliad has been met by Weniger with the theory that the Olympic games were at first chiefly a religious service and of only two days' duration. Gardiner⁹⁷, to cite one authority, has accepted Weniger's views on the time and the duration of the games. The point that Pindar was at least representing common beliefs concerning the multiplicity of events in the early Olympics has been weakened by Brinkmann's query as to whether Pindar should be accepted as an authority on history. The evidence of Thucydides, and an inscription, discounting the importance of the stade, has been met with other inscriptional evidence indicating a preference for this event, and by the analogy to the Heraean games, where this was the sole event. In reply to Beloch's question as to what events women should have participated in other than the stade, the answer is that they did participate in other events⁹⁸. However, other sources than the official list might mention merely the most prominent athlete or give preference to a local victor regardless of the event participated in, and it is perfectly possible, as is suggested by Gardiner, that the earliest records merely gave, for the sake of brevity, the name of the winner of the first event to be run off, even though

⁸⁸*Ibidem*, 176, note 1.

⁸⁹Die Siegerliste von Olympia, *Hermes* 64 (1929), 192-198.

⁹⁰Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, Volume 2, Number 557 (see note 36, above).

⁹¹*Ibidem*, 194.

⁹²In Olympiads 1-100 they occur in Olympiads 1, 2, 5, 52, 60, 96.

⁹³*Ibidem*, 196.

⁹⁴*Ibidem*, 197.

⁹⁵E. Norman Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World*, 34 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1930).

⁹⁶Bruno Schröder, *Der Sport in Altertum* (Berlin, Hanz Schoetz and Company, 1927).

⁹⁷Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals, 195-201 (see note 3, above).

⁹⁸*Ibidem*, 47, 239, 296.

from a remote period of antiquity there were a good many events. The conflicting accounts as to who was the first to run in the nude at Olympia may also be attributed to variance in local traditions. Such conflicts on the origin of customs, sayings, and things innumerable are no more rare in modern than in ancient history. As to Mahaffy's suspicions of eight Messenian victors in the first twelve Olympiads it has been shown by Brinkmann that such a condition would be perfectly consistent with the known political history of the period. Brinkmann and Weniger have also shown that the bronze dedicatory objects deserve no especial consideration. Since figures of oxen and sheep are included among them, the implication is that events employing these animals may have been a part of the festival. In answer to Beloch's doubts that a list of Olympic victors should be made almost a century before a list of Athenian Archons it might be said that, if we consider the enormous popularity of the Olympic festival and of Olympic victors, this need not be surprising. The opinion of Wilamowitz that the games could not have been pentetetic in the eighth century is counteracted by that of Gardiner, who believes definitely that they were pentetetic from 776 B. C. The contradictions in the accounts of the Anolympiads and the number of Hellanodicae would be partly cleared away by the emendation of Pausanias suggested by Wilamowitz, and by his assertion that Africanus agrees with other sources (except for obvious mistakes). Even Beloch and Körte admit the general agreement of the sources. The fact that the traditions have Elean tendencies would be damaging, unless it is considered that few Eleans are recorded as victors; if records had been arranged to favor Elis, they would certainly have included a large number of Elean heroes. Finally, as Gardiner has stated, it is inconceivable that Hippias was equipped merely with historical tact and lists of names for the compilation of the earlier portions of his register. Professor Adolf Wilhelm of Vienna, who was kind enough to help me by calling my attention to some of the pertinent literature, is inclined to view the early records as suspicious. Authorities on both sides of the question are agreed that this is true until Olympiad 50. But, even if we admit inconsistencies and conflicting accounts for the period covered by Olympiads 1-50, no adequate proof has been brought forward to show that this would affect the acceptance of 776 B. C. as the time when the Olympic festival was officially inaugurated and as an authentic date in Greek chronology.

WABASH COLLEGE,
CRAWFORDSVILLE, INDIANA

H. C. MONTGOMERY

**THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE
ATLANTIC STATES
TWENTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING,
APRIL 26-27, 1935**

The Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States was held at Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania, on April 26-27, 1935. The weather was fine, and the campus of the College was seen at its best. The attendance was good, especially on Saturday.

The programme was as follows:

Friday April 26:

Words of Welcome to the Association, Dr. William Mather Lewis, President of Lafayette College; Response, Professor Earl LeVerne Crum, President of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States; Paper: Ancient Rhetoric in the Modern College Course in Speech, Dr. John L. Heller, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania; Paper: The Antiquity of Oil and Wine, Professor Kenton F. Vickery, State Teachers College, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania; Paper: The Teaching of Latin Literature in a Small College, Professor Ray W. Pettingill, Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, New York; Paper: A Classicist of the Sixth Century: Gregory the Great, Sister Mary Borromeo, College Misericordia, Villa St. Teresa, Dallas, Pennsylvania; Report of the Executive Committee; Report of the Secretary-Treasurer; Appointment of Committees (Committee on Resolutions; Committee on Nomination of Officers for 1935-1936); Subscription Dinner at Hotel Easton, on Friday evening. After the Dinner there was a Paper: Dentistry Among the Greeks and the Romans, Professor Earl LeVerne Crum, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

Saturday, April 27:

Paper: "Sentina Rei Publicae": Campaign Issues, 63 B. C., Professor S. L. Mohler, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania; Paper: The Literary Lineage of Cupid: II, The Role of Amor in Latin Literature, Professor Floyd A. Spencer, Washington Square College, New York University, New York, New York; Paper: George Grote and His History of Greece, Dr. Tom B. Jones, Gowanda, New York; Paper: An Abstract of Horace's Thought, Dr. George K. Strodach, Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania; Paper: Literary Tastes of Pliny the Younger, Professor James Stinchcomb, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Paper: Latin and Progressive Education, Miss Mildred Dean, Head of the Department of Latin, The Public Schools of the District of Columbia; Invitation Luncheon, at the College Inn, Saturday, at 12:30; Paper: Classics and Relief Work: Recent Developments in the New York University Cartographic Study, Professor Casper J. Kraemer, Jr., Washington Square College, New York University, New York, New York; Paper (Illustrated): Some Illustrations in Medieval and Modern Art of the Laocoon Story, Professor George H. Allen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania; Paper: Observations on Greek Women, Dr. Moses Hadas, Columbia University, New York, New York.

The following resolutions were adopted by unanimous vote:

The Classical Association of the Atlantic States desires to express its thanks to the authorities of Lafayette College for the cordiality of the welcome to its beautiful campus and buildings and for the generous hospitality of the College in making the members its guests at luncheon.

The Association wishes to record also its appreciation of the courtesies extended by the management of the Hotel Easton, which made our stay one of happy memory.

The Association wishes also to express its special thanks to Professor George H. Allen, of Lafayette College, for his careful attention to all the details that contributed to the success of the meeting; to all the members of the Association who took part in the programme, for their interesting and instructive papers; and to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Association, Professor Charles Knapp, for the generous sacrifice of time and energy which the duties of his office and the editorial work on THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY entail.

Officers were elected as follows:

President, Miss Helen MacDonald, The Shippen School, Lancaster, Pennsylvania (now Abington Friends

School, Jenkintown, Pennsylvania); Secretary-Treasurer, Professor Charles Knapp, Barnard College, Columbia University; Vice-Presidents, Miss Mildred Dean, Supervisor of Latin in the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Professor Ray W. Pettingill, Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, New York, Professor Ralph V. D. Magoffin, New York University, University Heights, New York, Sister Maria Walburg, Mt. St. Joseph College, Chestnut Hill, Pennsylvania, Mr. E. S. Gerhard, Northeast High School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Dr. Cora A. Pickett, High School, Wilmington, Delaware, Professor W. K. Prentice, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, Professor Herman L. Ebeling, Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland.

These Officers, with the President of last year, Professor Earl LeV. Crum, of Lehigh University, and the Editor of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, Professor Charles Knapp, constitute the Executive Committee for 1935-1936.

The Report of the Secretary-Treasurer was, in substance, as follows:

On April 27, 1934, the balance to the credit of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, current checking account, was \$222.69. There was received from all sources, during the year, the sum of \$1,374.00. The total in this fund was thus \$1,596.69. The expenditures were \$1,473.78. The balance on April 20, 1935, was \$122.91.

On April 27, 1934, the balance to the credit of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, current checking account, was \$122.75. The receipts during the year were \$3,763.72. The total in this fund was thus \$3,886.47. The expenditures were \$3,804.96. The balance on April 20, 1935, was \$81.51.

320 subscriptions were transmitted to The Classical Journal, 82 to Classical Philology.

The total liabilities of the Secretary-Treasurer on April 20, 1935 were as follows: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, checking account, \$122.91; THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, checking account, \$81.51; The Classical Journal Account, \$1.50; Classical Philology Account, \$3.00; Endowment Fund, \$1,835.30; Emergency Fund, \$91.17; Mortgage Bond, \$1,000; Total, \$3,135.39.

The assets of the Association, in the hands of the Secretary-Treasurer, were as follows: In Corn Exchange Bank, New York, subject to check, \$208.92; Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, New York, Endowment Fund, \$1,835.30; Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, New York, Emergency Fund, \$91.17; Mortgage Bond, \$1,000; Total \$3,135.39.

CHARLES KNAPP

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

XII

The American Historical Review—October, Review, favorable, by C. Bradford Welles, of Robert Harbold McDowell, Stamped and Inscribed Objects from Seleucia on the Tigris; Review, favorable, by Preserved Smith, of *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdami, Denuo Recognitum et Auctum per P. S. Allen* . . . et H. M. Allen, Tom. VIII, 1529-1530. . . .; Review, favorable, by A. E. R. Boak, of Yale Classical Studies, Volume IV, Edited . . . by Austin M. Harmon; Review, favorable, by J. J. V., of Arnaldo Momigliano, *Claudius: The Emperor and His Achievement*, Translated by W. D. Hogarth; January, The Hellenistic World and Its Economic Development,

Michael I. Rostovtzeff ["To the Hellenistic period, then, we are indebted for many of the economic phenomena which now form the basis of our own economic life—economic unity of the civilized world, uniformity of economic life all over the civilized *oecumene*, initiation of mass production and first steps in the development of capitalism. . . ."]; Review, favorable, by J. E. Pomfret, of H. A. L. Fisher, *A History of Europe, Volume I: Ancient and Mediaeval*; Review, favorable, by George McLean Harper, of Zenon Papyri: *Business Papers of the Third Century B. C. Dealing with Palestine and Egypt, Volume I*, Edited with Introduction and Notes by William Linn Westermann and Elizabeth Sayre Hasenoehr; Review, favorable, by E. F. Scott, of Erwin R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*.

The American Journal of Semitic Languages—October, The Oriental Institute Archaeological Report on the Near East, Second Quarter 1935, Waldo H. Dubberstein [plans are announced for developing for students of the ancient Near East a tree-ring chronology of the cedars of Lebanon].

The American Scholar—Winter, 1936, The Genius of Horace, Andrew F. West; Review, appreciative and uncritical, by Clark S. Northup, of George Depue Hadzsits, *Lucretius and His Influence*.

Anglican Theological—October, Review, favorable, by Frederick C. Grant, of *Septuaginta, Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece Juxta LXX Interpretes*, Edited Alfred Rahlfs; Review, favorable, by Frederick C. Grant, of *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri*, Edited by H. Idris Bell and T. C. Skeat.

Art in America and Elsewhere—January, Ingres, Classicist and Antiquarian, Ilse Blum [with six photographic illustrations]; A Greco-Roman Relief in Naples, George W. Elderkin [the author identifies " . . . the two figures in the relief as Paris and Helen who are stopping in their flight from Sparta at some wayside shrine of Zeus, the father of Helen. Their attendant is Aeneas whom Aphrodite commanded to accompany Paris"].

Asia—January, Buried Cultures of the Near East, I, Cyrus H. Gordon [with five photographic illustrations, one map, and three drawings. This is the first of two articles describing a group of archaeological discoveries made in the Near East in recent years]; February, Buried Cultures of the Near East, II, Cyrus H. Gordon [with four photographic illustrations and one reconstruction drawing].

The Atlantic—March, Horace, Agnes Repplier [this is an appreciative essay on Horace and his poetry. " 'Out of Plato,' says Emerson, 'come all things that are still written or debated among men of thought.' And if this be true, we may add one word more. Out of Horace come most things that are still enjoyed and respected by men of feeling"].

Bibliotheca Sacra — July-August-September, Review, favorable, by E. F. Harrison, of *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri*, Edited by H. Idris Bell and T. C. Skeat; Review, fa-

avorable, by Bruce M. Metzger, of Septuaginta, Id Est Vetus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX Interpretes, Edidit Alfred Rahlfs.

Books—December 8, Review, favorable, by George Meason Whicher, of Grant Showerman, Monuments and Men of Ancient Rome; December 15, Review, summarizing and uncritical, by Lorine Pruette, of Vincenz Brun, Alcibiades, Beloved of Gods and Men; February 2, Review, uncritical, unsigned, of Procopius, Volume VI, The Anecdota or Secret History, With an English Translation by H. B. Dewing [this is a volume of The Loeb Classical Library]; March 1, Review, favorable, by Lorine Pruette, of Phyllis Bentley, Freedom, Farewell!; March 8, Review, summarizing, by Alice Beal Parsons, of Günther Birkenfeld, Augustus, Translated by Winifred Ray.

The Cambridge Historical Journal—Volume V, No. 1, An Early Motive of Roman Imperialism (201 B. C.), G. T. Griffith.

The Canadian Medical Association Journal, November—The Literary Illustrations of Aretaeus of Cappadocia, John Harold Couch and Herbert Newell Couch; February, The Caesarean Section, John Harold Couch and Herbert Newell Couch.

The Catholic Historical Review—January, Review, favorable, by Martin R. P. McGuire, of The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume IX: The Roman Republic, 133-44 B. C., Volume X: The Augustan Empire, 44 B. C.-A. D. 70, Volume of Plates IV; Review, favorable, by Abram Simon, of Erwin R. Goodenough, By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism; Brief notice, unfavorable, by Sister Mary Celeste, of Ralph V. D. Magoffin and Frederic Duncalf, Ancient and Medieval History; Brief notice, mildly favorable, by Brother Giles, of Dean P. Lockwood, A Survey of Classical Roman Literature.

Catholic World—November, What Horace Wrote: What Horace Meant, Raymond O'Flynn [Horace, Carmina 1. 38 is followed by a versified interpretation in 24 verses]; January, Non Omnis Moriar: To Quintus Horatius Flaccus (On the Commemoration of the Two-thousandth Anniversary of His Birthday, December 8, 1935), George Benson Hewetson [this is a poem of eight stanzas].

The Commonweal—September 6, Aristotle in Park Row, William Thomas Walsh; October 18, Review, favorable, by Philip Burnham, of C. R. Morey, Christian Art; November 1, Horace's Birthday Message, Hugh de Blacam [this is a metrical version in eight stanzas of Horace, Carmina 2.18 *Non ebur neque aureum*]; December 27, Brief review, favorable, unsigned, of Agnes Carr Vaughan, Within the Walls; January 17, Horace Remembered, Anne Kimball Tuell; February 7, Brief review, favorable, unsigned, of Aristotle, From Natural Science, Psychology, the Nichomachean Ethics, Translated and Edited by Philip Wheelright; Review, favorable, by T. Laurason Riggs, of Orazio Marucchi, Manual of Christian Archaeology, Translated and Adapted by Hubert Vecchierello.

Country Life—September, History of the Country Estate, I: Egypt, Antoinette Perrett [with four reconstruction drawings]; October, Collecting Roman Tear Bottles, Antoinette Perrett [with one Plate illustrating in color sixteen examples of Roman glass ware]; History of the Country Estate, II: Ancient Estate Parks in the Euphrates-Tigris Country, Antoinette Perrett [with three reconstruction drawings]; November, History of the Country Estate, III: The Roman Farm, Antoinette Perrett [with four illustrations]; December, The History of the Country Estate, IV: The Roman Pleasure Villa, Antoinette Perrett [with five illustrations].

Education—November, Summary of Published Research Studies in the Field of Latin Teaching, Lillian Dale Thomas.

E L H: A Journal of English Literary History—November, Spenser's *Virgils Gnat* and Its Latin Original, Henry G. Lotspeich [the author suggests that "... the actual text which Spenser used for his translation... was the one found in the 1542 Antwerp edition of Vergil's *Works* published by A. Dumaëus.... A line by line comparison of the Latin with the English shows that, in every case where Emerson proved that Spenser must have had the Bembo reading, that reading is in the Dumaëus text.... Study of the Latin text which Spenser had before him when he wrote *Virgils Gnat* shows that that poem is a good deal more than 'a vague and arbitrary paraphrase'"]; December, Art and Artifice in the *Iliad*: Or the Poetical Treatment of Character in Homer and Shakespeare, Elmer Edgar Stoll.

The English Historical Review—January, Short notice, favorable, by C. T. S., of D. M. Robinson, The Robinson Collection, Fascicule I (Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum); Short notice, favorable, by W. W. T., of Robert Harbold McDowell, Stamped and Inscribed Objects from Seleucia on the Tigris; Short notice, mildly favorable, by V. H. G., of J. H. Baxter and Charles Johnson, Medieval Latin Word-list from British and Irish Sources.

The Expository Times—October, The Problem of Aramaic Sources in the Gospels, T. W. Manson; *Ἀποθνήσκει* in the New Testament, L. H. Dennis and T. Nicklin; December, Recent Biblical Archaeology, L. W. Jack; February, Gospel Fragments, unsigned [this is a book notice commenting favorably on The New Gospel Fragments, issued by the Trustees of the British Museum, and An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel, Edited by C. H. Roberts]; Review, very favorable, unsigned, of E. A. Speiser, Excavations at Tepe Gawra; The 'Puzzling Passage' in the New Gospel Fragments, F. J. Brown [this deals with a passage in an Unknown Gospel, the fragments of which have been published by H. Idris Bell]; Ancient Finger Prints, unsigned [this brief note states how in the course of the excavations of Mizpah the finger prints of the ancient potters are collected].

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT

ADOLPH F. PAULI